

Niccolò Machiavelli, the Baron de Montesquieu and the destabilizing effects of international migration

Barclay, William

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Barclay, W. (2017). Niccolò Machiavelli, the Baron de Montesquieu and the destabilizing effects of international migration. *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs*, 2(3), 9-29. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-50095-7>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>



© 2017 William Barclay

This is an open access article distributed under the CC-BY 3.0 License.

Peer review method: Double-Blind

Date of acceptance: December 09, 2016

Date of publication: January 18, 2017

Original scientific article

UDC 355.45:325.25-027.511



Indexing

Abstracting

NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI, THE BARON DE MONTESQUIEU AND THE DESTABILIZING EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION

William Barclay

Carleton University, Canada

[willbarclay13v\[at\]gmail.com](mailto:willbarclay13v@gmail.com)

Abstract

This essay demonstrates that, although modern liberals incessantly promote the EU as a living exemplar for the virtues of contemporary liberalism and basic, unrestrictive, migration policies, the experiences of innumerable contemporary EU states, such as France, contradict these spurious claims, since, instead of becoming enriched or improved, countless EU states have deteriorated and become fraught with social conflict, insecurity, and instability, as a result of their minimally restrictive, liberal, migration policies and consequent penetration with foreign, inherently contradictory ideology. Furthermore, this essay demonstrates that, despite the ignorant exclamations of modern liberals, the inviolable patriarch of liberalism, the Baron de Montesquieu, in addition to the pre-eminent, indispensable, paterfamilias of realism, Niccolò Machiavelli, explicitly confirm that, if any state fails to adequately restrict the migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will inevitably become penetrated by a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, and, consequently, eviscerated by an unrelenting insecurity.

Key words: Denmark; European Union; France; Machiavelli; Migration; Montesquieu; Security

GLOBALIZATION, MIGRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Unquestionably, the advent of globalization has dramatically transformed innumerable aspects of the modern international political system, as well as severely disturbed the bloated dogma of elder political theory. Yet, although the process of globalization has certainly meted out multitudinous, diverse, and consequential reforms within the modern international political system, it is evident that several of globalization's most transformative modifications have been wrought specifically vis a vis the phenomenon of international migration, since the onset of globalization within the international political system has tremendously facilitated and encouraged the migration of people, ideas, and goods between states (Woods 2008, 252).

Via its fundamental processes, globalization has emphatically eliminated countless archaic impediments to international migration, such as institutional barriers and tariffs, for example (Woods 2008, 252). Consequently, international migration has become superfluous within the modern international political system and numerous contemporary states have become enamored of the benefits that can, potentially, accompany the migration of people, goods, and ideas within the international political system. As a result, a plethora of modern states have modified and liberalized their political policies, in order to allow people, ideas, and goods to migrate across their borders with ease. For example, throughout the latter half of the twentieth century, various European states combined themselves into the European Union (EU): an amorphous entity, that is at once supranational, as well as intergovernmental, and wherein any person who possesses EU citizenship, as well as a valid EU passport, resultantly possesses the ability to freely migrate from any EU state to another (Your Europe 2015).

As the unrelenting onset of globalization has continued to enable and encourage international migration within the modern political system, myriad states and political pundits have become captivated by the superficial benefits¹ that can sometimes accompany the migration of people and ideas. Therefore, a minimally restricted international migration of peoples and ideas throughout the international political system has become the subject of persistent praise and arduous promotion throughout the modern era (Baylis 2008, 8). For instance, countless modern liberal theorists, such as Chandran Kukathas, argue that the unfettered migration of people, goods, and ideas between states is invariably a beneficial process, because it subjects states and their people to diverse strains of cross-cultural discourse, which, in turn, inevitably causes states to progress, improve, and become enriched culturally, as well as politically (Kukathas 2005, 215).

However, although an inordinate number of contemporary liberal political actors and pundits fervently promote minimally restrictive migration policies and enthusiastically proclaim the migration of people and ideas between states as a quintessentially beneficial process, their pronouncements are utterly misled and unequivocally inaccurate. Rather, despite the romantic edicts of modern liberalism, the experiences and the histories of innumerable nations resoundingly demonstrate that, if any state fails to adequately restrict and effectively regulate the international migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will incontrovertibly become destabilized, and its national security irrevocably shattered, due to the fact that the state's minimally restrictive, inadequate, migration policies will inevitably cause the state to become penetrated by a foreign ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology and values.

If a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the inherently contradictory ideology struggles for political expression within the state, the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents comprehensively reject the state, as well as the legitimate channels for political expression within the state, due to the fact that the state, along with its essential political institutions, structures, and laws, is predicated upon a fundamental political ethos, norms, and values that the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents explicitly repudiate. Subsequently, when the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents pursue political

¹ Economic productivity and ideological diversity, for example.

expression and accommodation within the state, they struggle violently against the state, without a modicum of respect for the state's essential laws or the rights of the state's citizenry, which causes the state's citizenry² to become reciprocally violent and hostile in turn, since their security has been demonstrably threatened via this flagrant violation and disregard of the state, its constitutive laws, and its fundamental political order. As a result, the state and its society degenerate into a condition that distinctly emulates the hostile, Hobbesian state of nature, and, consequently, overwhelming insecurity and instability permeate throughout the state.

Moreover, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the state attempts to accommodate the inherently contradictory ideology within its socio-political fabric, the state is inevitably forced to abandon its fundamental political ethos, norms, and values, as well as its essential political apparatus and laws, since the state attempts to express a political ideology which categorically controverts and repudiates as invalid the constitutive principles of the state's society and its political structure as a whole. Consequently, the state inexorably deviates from the political trajectory and the constitution that previously engendered its success and prosperity within the international political system, as well as allowed it to secure itself against the omnipresent, eternal, rigors of fortuna.³ Therefore, the state becomes destabilized, fraught with insecurity, and inevitably collapses into a nigh inescapable, degenerative cycle, which terminates, necessarily, with the manifestation of anarchic conditions within the state, and, summarily, the state's precipitous collapse.

In fact, although modern liberals incessantly promote the EU as a living exemplar for the virtues of contemporary liberalism and basic, unrestrictive, migration policies, the experiences and the histories of innumerable contemporary EU states contradict these spurious claims. Truthfully, when various EU states, such as France or Denmark, are analyzed, the experiences of these despondent, woe-begotten nations clearly confirm that, instead of becoming enriched or improved, the states of the EU have actually deteriorated and become fraught with rampant social conflict, insecurity, and instability, as a result of their minimally restrictive, liberal, migration policies and consequent penetration with foreign, inherently contradictory ideology.

Furthermore, despite the ignorant, contrantarian⁴, exclamations of modern liberals and their incessant promotion of an unrestricted migration of people, goods, and ideas between states, the foundational and inviolable documents of liberal political thought, in addition to the pre-eminent, indispensable elucidations of realism, unequivocally confirm that, if any state fails to adequately restrict the migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will inevitably become penetrated by a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, and, as a result, eviscerated by an unrelenting insecurity. For example, in one of the obligatory articulations of liberal political theory, *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, the seminal architect of

² Specifically, those citizens who reject the newly introduced, inherently contradictory, ideology.

³ "I liken her to one of these violent rivers which, when they become enraged, flood the plains, ruin the trees and the buildings, lift earth from this part, drop in another; each person flees before them, everyone yields to their impetus without being able to hinder them in any regard."

Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 98.

⁴ 'Contrantarianism' is a redoubtable form of sophistry, whereby an individual opposes the beliefs of others simply for the sake of opposition and wanton oppression.

liberal political thought, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, incontrovertibly declares that the migration of a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology within a state is inevitably and profoundly destabilizing; in addition, the Baron de Montesquieu specifically cites the penetration of foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology into the Roman state as the underlying cause for the ancient Roman Empire's unceremonious decline and virulent collapse. Moreover, in one of the quintessential expositions of realist political theory, *Discourses on Livy*, the primogenitor of realism, Niccolò Machiavelli, argues that, if a state is injected with a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, then its political constitution and national security will ineluctably become compromised, and, consequently, the state will unerringly implode into a degenerative cycle of anarchy and insecurity, if it is not expediently reoriented according to its original, foundational political ideology and values.

Therefore, it is readily apparent that, in spite of the idealistic, enchanting, and endearing entreaties of modern liberalism, if any state adopts minimal, meagerly restrictive, migration policies and fails to appropriately restrict the migration of people and ideas throughout its society, then that state will certainly become destabilized, and its national security irrevocably shattered, due to the fact that the state's ineffective and unrestrictive migration policies will inevitably cause the state to become brutally penetrated by a foreign ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology and fundamentally repudiates its essential political structure.

IMMIGRATION, IDEOLOGY AND INSTABILITY

Throughout the course of human history, international migration has consistently exerted an undeniable influence within the international political system. For example, the international migration of people has unerringly caused the populations, and thereby the productive capacities, of countless states to ebb and flow in response to the demands of various international socio-economic factors (Doty 2009, 171). Truthfully, the consequences that are produced via the international migration of people, goods, and ideas within the international political system are not comprehensively negative, and, if states do appropriately accommodate international migration within their borders, then they can achieve certain potential benefits. Even Niccolò Machiavelli, a revered and renowned realist who speaks emphatically of the dangers that faithfully accompany any unregulated migration of people and ideas, readily acknowledges that, when international migration is adequately regulated, it produces undeniably positive effects within any nation or state. For instance, in his revered work, *Discourses on Livy*, Machiavelli states that:

those who plan for a city to make a great empire should contrive with all industry to make it full of inhabitants, for without this abundance of men one will never succeed in making a city great. This is done in two modes: by love and by force. By love through keeping the ways open and secure for foreigners who plan to come to inhabit it so that everyone may inhabit it willingly; by force through undoing the neighboring cities and sending their inhabitants to inhabit your city (Machiavelli 1996, 134-135).

Yet, in spite of the advantages that states can certainly accrue if they appropriately accommodate the international migration of people, goods, and ideas within their borders,

the histories of innumerable failed empires unequivocally demonstrate that international migration is by no means a necessarily beneficial phenomenon. Rather, the experiences of countless nations, ancient and modern alike, inexorably confirm that, if any state fails to adequately restrict and effectively regulate the international migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will incontrovertibly become destabilized, and its national security irrevocably shattered, due to the fact that the state's minimally restrictive migration policies will inevitably cause the state to become penetrated by a foreign ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology. In fact, although modern liberals relentlessly promote the EU as an indisputable proof for the virtues of minimal, unrestrictive, migration policies, the experiences of innumerable contemporary EU states contradict these spurious claims. For example, when the experiences of various EU states, such as France or Denmark, are analyzed, the experiences of these unfortunate nations emphatically confirm that, instead of becoming enriched or improved, the states of the EU have actually deteriorated and become fraught with rampant social conflict and insecurity, as a result of their inadequately restrictive, liberal, migration policies, and consequent penetration with foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology.

Firstly, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the inherently contradictory ideology struggles for political expression within the state, the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents comprehensively reject the state, as well as the legitimate channels for political expression within the state, due to the fact that the state, along with its essential political institutions, structures, and laws, is predicated upon a fundamental political ethos, norms, and values that the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents explicitly repudiate. Subsequently, when the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents pursue political expression and accommodation within the state, they struggle violently against the state, without a modicum of respect for the state's obligatory laws or the rights of the state's citizenry, which causes the state's citizenry to become reciprocally violent and hostile in turn, since their security has been demonstrably threatened via this flagrant violation and disregard of the state, its constitutive laws, and its fundamental political order. As a result, the state and its society degenerate into a condition that eerily emulates the hostile, Hobbesian state of nature, and, consequently, overwhelming insecurity and instability permeate throughout the state.

When a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology and values, the newly introduced ideology initially behaves similarly to any other burgeoning ideology within the state: it begins to coalesce and attempts to express itself within the state's socio-political fabric. However, as the newly introduced, inherently contradictory, ideology endeavours to accommodate itself within the state, its comportment differs dramatically from the behavior that is typically exhibited by ideologies that are congruent with the state's foundational, constitutive, political ideology. Rather than attempting to pursue political accommodation and expression within the state via pacific and legitimate means, the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents categorically controvert the state and its fundamental political apparatus, as well as the legitimate channels for political discourse and expression within the state, due to the fact that the state and its essential political institutions are predicated upon a political ideology, norms, and values that the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents unequivocally repudiate. Consequently, the inherently contradictory ideology

and its adherents pursue political accommodation and expression within the state via violent and volatile means that flagrantly disregard the state, as well as its essential political structures, institutions, and laws.

Furthermore, since the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents blatantly disregard the state and its fundamental political apparatus via their violent, volatile, quest for political expression and accommodation, the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents inevitably violate the national security of the state, as well as the personal security of its populace. Therefore, the state's citizenry becomes terrorized, and, as a result, innumerable citizens who were once placid, pacific, members of society summarily become incited into a violent body within the state and abruptly abandon the Leviathan,⁵ as well as its laws. Rather than search for security within the newly destabilized state and its social confines, these terrorized citizens instead endeavor to protect their own respective personal security via their own respective personal power, and with violence if necessary, against any potential attacks or insecurity; consequently, these citizens violently clash and conflict with the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents. Subsequently, the whole of the state's citizenry is effectively plunged into a condition that distinctly resembles the hostile, Hobbesian state of nature, an anti-social condition wherein security, order, and the laws of the state do not exist,⁶ and, as a result, the state is profoundly destabilized and devastated by an ineffable insecurity, which, unfortunately, remains consistently entrenched within the state until one of the discordant political ideologies is eliminated or excised from within the state and its society.

The inveterate experiences of innumerable EU nations comprehensively confirm the aforementioned assertions. For instance, if Denmark's experiences within the contemporary international political system are analyzed, then they incontrovertibly demonstrate that the Danish state has been plunged into an exigent insecurity, specifically as a result of its abhorrently inadequate migration policies and the violent, Hobbesian, disposition that these meager migration policies have ineludibly engendered within the Danish citizenry. During the modern era, Denmark has enthusiastically embraced overwhelmingly minimal and comprehensively liberal migration policies, and, consequently, people have been permitted to migrate throughout the Danish state without any significant impediment or restriction (Brochmann et al. 2012, 9). However, since Denmark has meagerly restricted and inadequately regulated the migration of people across its borders, even individuals and ideologies that inherently contradict and literally repudiate the foundational liberal-democratic political ideology, ethos, laws, and structures of the Danish state have been allowed to migrate within Danish society, despite the fact that these ideologies and their adherents fervently desire and, in fact, proactively endeavor, to collapse the Danish state

⁵ Alternatively, 'the state', according to Hobbes.

Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Edwin Curley (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994).

⁶ In the state of nature "...it is manifest that during the time men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war, and such a war is of every man against every man...Whatsoever therefore is consequent to a time of war, where every man is enemy to every man, the same is consequent to the time wherein men live without other security than what their own strength and their own invention shall furnish them withal. In such a condition there is...no society, and which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death, and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. In this state every person has a natural right or liberty to do anything one thinks necessary for preserving one's own life; and life is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ed. Edwin Curley (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994), 76.

and destroy its fundamental political apparatus, in order to erect in its stead a state and a society which reflects only their own fundamental political principles and beliefs.

Unsurprisingly, as a result of Denmark's abhorrently inadequate and minimally restrictive migration policies, the Danish state has been brutally penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts and literally repudiates virtually every aspect of Denmark's foundational liberal-democratic political ideology: orthodox Islamic ideology (Leiken 2005). Moreover, once orthodox Islamic ideology successfully infiltrated within the Danish state and entrenched itself within the Danish socio-political fabric, its adherents savagely attacked the Danish state and violently rejected Denmark's essential laws, as well as the legitimate channels for political expression and accommodation within the Danish state, due to the fact that the Danish state is predicated upon a distinctly liberal-democratic political ideology, as well as various quintessential liberal-democratic political principles, such as human autonomy, liberty, and freedom of speech or expression, that are categorically controverted and repudiated by orthodox Islamic ideology as *a priori* false and invalid (Dunne 2008, 115).

For instance, in December 2010, an ominous terrorist plot was perpetrated by five militant Islamic terrorists against the Danish state and Jyllands-Posten, a Danish newspaper, in order to exact revenge for cartoons of the prophet Muhammad that were published by Jyllands-Posten in 2005 (The Copenhagen Post 2012). Prior to their expedient arrest, the five Islamic terrorists endeavoured to imitate the 2008 terrorist attacks in Mumbai, wherein, over a period of four days, ten members of Lashkar-e-Taiba, an Islamic terrorist organization from Pakistan, executed a series of 12 coordinated attacks throughout the city of Mumbai, which ultimately killed 166 people and wounded over 600 others (Senguptanov 2008). Fortunately, however, a concerted and strenuous cooperative effort between Danish and Swedish security forces successfully apprehended the Danish terrorists before they were able to fully realize their awful ambitions and wreak absolute havoc within the Danish state (The Copenhagen Post 2012).

Furthermore, on February 14th, 2015, in an effort to eradicate Denmark's liberal-democratic political ideology and assert the supremacy of orthodox Islamic ideology within Danish society, Omar Abdel Hamid El-Hussein, a Danish citizen who was radicalized and converted into an adherent of orthodox Islamic ideology, definitively rejected the legitimate channels for political expression within the Danish state and violently attacked a debate in Copenhagen about free-speech that was hosted by the Swedish cartoonist Lars Vilks (Evans et al. 2015). During his initial attack, El-Hussein savagely murdered one Danish citizen and seriously wounded three Danish police officers, before fleeing from his crimes (Evans et al. 2015). Moreover, following his initial, despicable, actions, El-Hussein subsequently perpetrated another deplorable attack against the innocent citizens of Copenhagen, whereby he killed one Jewish citizen and wounded two Danish police officers near Copenhagen's main synagogue, before he was himself finally slain in northern Copenhagen by the Danish police (Evans et al. 2015).

As a result of the aforementioned attacks, in addition to innumerable other violations, the Danish state has been wracked with comprehensive violence, insecurity, and instability. Specifically, Denmark's national security, as well as the personal security of the Danish citizenry has been grievously threatened, and, consequently, the Danish citizenry has lost faith in the Danish state's ability to safeguard its security, which has caused numerous Danish citizens to pursue security via their own respective personal power, rather

than through the state and its laws. Subsequently, innumerable Danish citizens who once adhered to the pacific, liberal-democratic, laws of the Danish state, and therefore implicitly accepted the Danish state's foundational liberal-democratic political ideology, have rejected the Danish state, as well as its pacific, liberal-democratic laws; instead, these citizens have become overtly hostile and violent towards the adherents of Islamic ideology within Danish society.

For example, following El-Hussein's aforementioned attacks against the Danish state and its society, numerous Danish citizens started to eschew the legitimate channels for political expression within the Danish state, as well as the Danish state's liberal-democratic political structure. These Danish citizens, in an effort to assert their own political ideology and displace orthodox Islam from within Denmark's socio-political fabric, perpetrated various violent and hostile anti-Muslim attacks within the Danish state. For example, in 2015, various Danish citizens vandalized a Muslim cemetery in Odense, as well as its surrounding community, in retaliation for El-Hussein's previous terrorist attacks in Copenhagen (Kaplan 2015).

Consequently, it is indisputable that the introduction of orthodox Islamic ideology within Danish society, at the behest of Denmark's own minimally restrictive, abhorrently inadequate migration policies, no less, has caused a distinctly violent, virulent, and nationally destabilizing conflict to permeate throughout the Danish citizenry, whereby innumerable people within Danish society have been caused to reject the pacific laws and the liberal-democratic ideology of the Danish state, indeed the Danish state as a whole, and to, instead, attack each other with wanton venom and vigor, in order to protect their own personal security and assert their own political beliefs. Ergo, it is incontrovertibly evident that the Danish state has been plunged into an exigent insecurity, specifically as a result of its grossly unrestrictive, deplorably insufficient migration policies and the violent, Hobbesian, disposition that these meager policies have engendered within the Danish citizenry.

Therefore, it is readily apparent, and the experiences of innumerable EU states in fact incontrovertibly confirm, that, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the inherently contradictory ideology struggles for political expression and accommodation within the state, the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents comprehensively reject the state, as well as the legitimate channels for political expression within the state, due to the fact that the state and its essential political apparatus are predicated upon a fundamental political ethos and values that the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents literally repudiate. Subsequently, when the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents pursue political expression and accommodation within the state, they struggle violently against the state, without a modicum of respect for the state's obligatory laws or the rights of the state's citizenry, which causes the state's citizenry to become reciprocally violent and hostile in turn, since their national and personal security has been demonstrably threatened via this flagrant violation and disregard of the state, its constitutive laws, and its fundamental political order. As a result, the state and its society degenerate into a condition that eerily emulates the hostile, Hobbesian state of nature, and, consequently, overwhelming insecurity and instability permeate throughout the state.

Moreover, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the state attempts to accommodate

the inherently contradictory ideology within its socio-political fabric, the state is inevitably forced to abandon its fundamental political ethos and values, as well as its essential political apparatus and laws, since the state attempts to express a political ideology which categorically controverts and repudiates as invalid the constitutive principles of the state's society, as well as its political structure as a whole. Consequently, the state inexorably deviates from the political trajectory and the political constitution that previously engendered its success and prosperity within the international political system, as well as allowed it to secure itself against the omnipresent, eternal rigors of *fortuna*. Therefore, the state becomes destabilized, fraught with insecurity, and inevitably collapses into a nigh inescapable, degenerative cycle, which terminates, necessarily, with the manifestation of anarchic conditions within the state and, summarily, the state's precipitous collapse.

When an ideology migrates within a state, the veritable essence of the ideology, its constitutive principles, ethos, values, and norms, will inevitably and undeniably come to be expressed and accommodated within the state's social fabric. For example, if a novel ideology is introduced within a democratic state, then the newly introduced ideology, as well as its essential norms, values, principles, and beliefs, are all inevitably expressed and accommodated within the state and its society via the voting habits of the burgeoning ideology's adherents and the candidates that they elect. However, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the state attempts to accommodate the newly introduced, inherently contradictory, ideology within its socio-political fabric, the state undergoes a tectonic and profoundly destabilizing change.

If a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the state attempts to accommodate the newly introduced, inherently contradictory, ideology within its socio-political fabric the state is inexorably forced to discard various indispensable aspects of its fundamental political apparatus and to essentially alter its prototypical political constitution, due to the fact that the newly introduced, inherently contradictory, ideology is predicated upon political principles, values, beliefs and norms that unequivocally repudiate and climacterically controvert the constitutive political ethos and structure of the state. Subsequently, since the state is forced to emphatically abandon the obligatory rudiments of its political apparatus and irrevocably metamorphose its fundamental political constitution in order to accommodate the inherently contradictory ideology, the quintessential political structure of the state is essentially transformed, and the state consequently adopts political principles, practices, institutions, ideology, and policies that, due to their ineffective, incongruent, and injurious nature, were previously altogether alien and unfathomable within its pre-existing society. Moreover, since the state is forced to abandon the constitutive political principles, practices, policies, institutions and ideology of its society, the state is thereby precluded from pursuing the essential means and methods that heretofore allowed it to secure itself against the constant, lethal, rigors of *fortuna* and caused it to succeed within the inherently anarchic, violent, and volatile international political system. As a result, the state deviates from its proverbial 'good'⁷ and abandons the

⁷ "For all the beginning of sects, republics, and kingdoms must have some goodness in them, by means of which they may regain their first reputation and their first increase." Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy*, trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 209.

fundamental political trajectory, as well as the essential political constitution, that previously engendered its success, security, and prosperity within the international political system. Therefore, the state becomes unequivocally destabilized, thoroughly fraught with insecurity, and inevitably implodes into a nigh-inescapable, degenerative, cycle, which terminates, necessarily, with the manifestation of anarchic conditions within the state and, summarily, the state's precipitous collapse, if the state is not immediately and expediently reoriented towards its quintessential, secure, political trajectory and constitution.

The miserable experiences of countless contemporary EU nations emphatically confirm the aforementioned assertions. For example, France's experiences within the modern international political system categorically demonstrate/confirm that the French state has become profoundly destabilized and rendered drastically insecure, specifically due to the fact that its liberal migration policies have caused it to become penetrated by a foreign, inherently contradictory ideology, and, as a result, France has been forced to radically deviate from the fundamental political trajectory and the elemental political constitution that previously permitted it to succeed and secure itself within the international political system. During the modern era, France has unabashedly embraced the absolutely unrestrictive and passionately liberal migration policies of the EU, and, consequently, people and ideas have been permitted to migrate throughout the French state without any appreciable impediment or barrier (Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies 2007). However, since France has only meagerly and inadequately restricted the migration of people and ideas across its borders during the modern era, even people and ideologies that inherently contradict and unequivocally repudiate the foundational liberal-democratic political ideology, institutions, laws, and structure of the French state have been allowed to migrate within French society, despite the fact that these ideologies and their adherents passionately desire and, in fact, enthusiastically endeavour, to implode the French state and to eradicate its essential political apparatus, in order to erect in its stead a state which reiterates and reflects only their own fundamental political principles, norms, values, and beliefs.

Naturally therefore, as is wont to happen, the French state's abhorrently inadequate, minimally restrictive, and barely ethereal migration policies, have caused France to be ruthlessly penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational liberal-democratic ideology and categorically spurns the whole of French society: orthodox Islamic ideology (Leiken 2005). Moreover, once orthodox Islamic ideology successfully infiltrated within the French state and entrenched itself within French society, it began to struggle for political expression within France and, unfortunately, the French state consequently attempted to accommodate the ideology and its dogma within its socio-political fabric. However, due to the fact that orthodox Islamic ideology inherently contradicts and literally controverts the foundational liberal-democratic political ethos and structure of the French state, in addition to the French state's constitutive liberal-democratic political principles, such as pluralism, freedom of expression, and human equality for example, the French state has been forced to slough off and discard various essential aspects of its fundamental political apparatus in order to accommodate orthodox Islamic ideology within its socio-political fabric, and, as a result, the French state has subsequently deviated from the quintessential liberal-democratic political ideology and the obligatory political iteration that previously caused it to achieve a comprehensive success, prosperity, and security within the international political system.

For instance, the political principle of *laïcité*, or the belief that there should be an absence of religious involvement in government affairs, as well as an absence of government involvement in religious affairs, is a rudiment of France's liberal-democratic national ideology, and, therefore, a constitutive principle of the French state (Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs at Georgetown University). Furthermore, since France has consistently adhered to the principle of *laïcité* and has unerringly accommodated this principle within its socio-political fabric, the French state has heretofore enhanced its national security and caused its nation to prosper, due to the fact the French state has remained unimpeded and unbothered by the ethical and moral issues that plague those states whose politics are dictated and determined according to their religious beliefs and doctrines, such as Saudi Arabia (Dekmejian 1994, 630). However, since the orthodox Islamic ideology that has penetrated into France, via the French state's abhorrently inadequate migration policies, explicitly rejects a separation of church and state, and, instead, calls for all political states to reflect Islamic, 'sharia', law (Leiken 2005), the French state has consequently been forced to renounce, repudiate and reject the essential principle of *laïcité* from within its society. For example, due to the migration of orthodox Islamic ideology and scores of its adherents within the French cities of Amiens, Roubaix, and Marseille, in addition to countless other French polities, various French neighbourhoods are now governed according to sharia law, and, as a result, the once-constitutive principle of *laïcité* has effectively been eradicated and expunged from these environs (Kern 2012).

Moreover, in addition to the principle of *laïcité*, the political principle of 'personal liberty,' an imperative, elemental, and constituent component within any liberal-democratic political ideology or structure, has consistently been considered sacrosanct and inviolable within France (Perrault and Debaecker 2015). However, since the migration of orthodox Islamic ideology throughout French society has summarily elicited innumerable terrorist attacks and a profound insecurity within the French state, the French regime has drastically restricted, violated, and contravened the personal liberty of the French citizenry, in a vain attempt to excise Islamic terrorism from within its society. For example, following the terrorist attacks in Paris on November 13th, 2015, the French regime invoked a state of emergency within France's borders, and, thereby, dubiously allocated itself with the power, as well as the potential, to egregiously violate, contradict, and refuse the personal liberty and the rights of the French citizenry, despite the fact that this endeavor is quintessentially incongruent with the French state and with France's foundational liberal-democratic ideology (Griffin 2015).

As the persistent penetration of orthodox Islamic ideology within France has forced the French state to abandon its quintessential and constitutive political principles, such as *laïcité* and the personal liberty of its citizens, France has consequently been precluded from its ideal political functions and forced to deviate from its essential political trajectory and fundamental political constitution, which has inexorably destabilized the French state and caused it to dramatically degenerate. For example, due to the fact that France has abandoned even a token respect for the principle of *laïcité*, and, moreover, has ominously separated the French citizenry from its liberty, the French state's once propitious economic growth has emphatically stalled and unemployment in France has ballooned to ludicrous proportions (Warner 2014). Furthermore, since 2012, France has been victimized by vicious and innumerable Islamic terrorist attacks, which incontrovertibly confirms that

national security within the French state has unequivocally and undeniably eroded (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development 2016).

Consequently, it is irrefutably evident that, following the penetration of orthodox Islam and its inherently contradictory ideology within French society, at the behest of France's own minimally restrictive, abhorrently inadequate migration policies, tragically, the French state has been forced to abandon the foundational political principles, ideology, policies, institutions, and practices that hitherto engendered its national success and security within the international political system, regardless of the precipitous national degeneration and the delectable economic decline that this deviation has inculcated within French society. Subsequently, it is absolutely incontrovertible that France, as a result of its own overwhelmingly inadequate, unrestrictive, migration policies and contingent penetration with a foreign, inherently contradictory ideology, has been forced to radically deviate from the fundamental political trajectory and the quintessential political constitution that previously permitted it to succeed and secure itself within the violent, inherently anarchic, international political system, and, consequently, has collapsed into the caress of a supple insecurity.

Therefore, it is readily apparent, and, unfortunately, comprehensively confirmed via the incorrigible experiences of innumerable forlorn EU nations, that if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the state attempts to accommodate the inherently contradictory ideology within its socio-political fabric, the state is inevitably forced to abandon its fundamental political ethos and values, as well as its essential political apparatus and laws, since the state attempts to express a political ideology which categorically controverts and repudiates as invalid the constitutive principles of the state's society and its political structure as a whole. Consequently, the state inexorably deviates from the political trajectory and the political constitution that previously engendered its success within the international political system and allowed it to secure itself against the omnipresent, eternal rigors of *fortuna*. Therefore, the state becomes destabilized, fraught with insecurity, and inevitably collapses into a nigh inescapable degenerative cycle, which terminates, necessarily, with the manifestation of anarchic conditions within the state and, summarily, the state's precipitous collapse.

MACHIAVELLI AND MONTESQUIEU: DISCOURSES ON MIGRATION AND THE COLLAPSE OF ROME

Although the unfortunate experiences and the wretched histories of countless nations inexorably confirm the desolation and the collapse that unequivocally await any state which indulges in and embraces inadequately restrictive and ineffectual migration policies, innumerable endearing modern liberal idealists still attempt to champion and to plead for an unmitigated migration of people and ideas throughout the international political system. However, despite the ignorant supplications of modern liberals, the foundational and inviolable documents of liberal political thought, in addition to the pre-eminent and indispensable elucidations of realism, explicitly confirm that, if any state fails to adequately restrict the migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will inevitably become penetrated by a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, and, as a result, eviscerated by an unrelenting insecurity.

Firstly, throughout the obligatory articulation of liberal political theory, *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, one of the seminal architects of liberal political thought, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, incontrovertibly declares that the migration of a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology within a state is inevitably pernicious and profoundly destabilizing; in addition, the Baron de Montesquieu specifically cites the penetration of foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology into the Roman state as the underlying cause for the Roman Empire's unceremonious decline and virulent collapse. For example, the Baron de Montesquieu states that:

the strength of the [Roman] republic consisted in discipline, austerity of morals, and the constant observance of certain customs, they corrected the abuses that the law had not foreseen, or that the ordinary magistrate could not punish...In Rome, everything that could introduce dangerous novelties, change the heart or mind of the citizen, and deprive the state — if I dare use the term — of perpetuity, all disorders, domestic or public, were reformed by the censors (Montesquieu 1999, 86).

Moreover, in *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, the Baron de Montesquieu writes that:

Rome [...] accorded the coveted right of citizenship to the allies who had not yet ceased being loyal, and gradually to all. After this, Rome was no longer a city whose people had but a single spirit, a single love of liberty, a single hatred of tyranny [...] Once the peoples of Italy became its citizens, each city brought to Rome its genius, its particular interests, and its dependence on some great protector. The distracted city no longer formed a complete whole. And since citizens were such only by a kind of fiction, since they no longer had the same magistrates, the same walls, the same gods, the same temples, and the same graves, they no longer saw Rome with the same eyes, no longer had the same love of country, and Roman sentiments were no more (Montesquieu 1999, 92-93).

In these two aforementioned quotations from *Considerations on the Causes of The Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, the Baron de Montesquieu describes how the strength and security of the Roman state emanated from the quintessentially Roman ideology, values, and norms that determined Rome's socio-political constitution and structure. Furthermore, via the two aforementioned quotations, the Baron de Montesquieu unequivocally communicates that, once the Roman Empire began to admit the many Italian peoples into its citizenry, the foreign customs and norms of the various Italian peoples irreversibly altered the national ideology and values of the Roman state, and, consequently, the Roman state was caused to deviate from the quintessentially Roman ideology and values whereby it had previously preserved itself and made itself prosperous, which thereby compromised the national security and political constitution of the Roman state.

Additionally, the Baron de Montesquieu elucidates further in *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline* and emphatically states that:

In this later period, however, not only did [the Romans] fail to observe this proportion of auxiliary troops, but they even filled the corps of national troops with barbarian soldiers [...] Thus, they established practices wholly contrary to those that had made them universal masters. And, as formerly their constant policy was to keep the military art for themselves and deprive all their neighbors of it, they were now destroying it among themselves and establishing it among others [...] Here, in a word, is the history of the Romans. By means of their maxims they conquered all peoples, but when they had succeeded in doing so, their republic could not endure [...] Contrary maxims employed by the new government made their greatness collapse (Montesquieu 1999, 168-169).

In the preceding quotation, the Baron de Montesquieu clearly explains that the adoption of foreign, barbarian soldiers into the Roman military caused the foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology and practices that the barbarians espoused to become entrenched within Roman society and displaced the quintessentially Roman national ideology and values from the Roman state and the Roman citizenry. Furthermore, via the preceding quotation, the Baron de Montesquieu clearly argues that this entrenchment of foreign, inherently contradictory, barbarian ideology within Roman society, and the resultant displacement of the quintessentially Roman national ideology and values from the Roman state and the Roman citizenry, prompted the Roman state to deviate from its essential foundational national ideology and ideal political trajectory, which consequently caused the Roman state to collapse.

Therefore, via the aforementioned quotations from the elemental articulation of liberal political theory, *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, it is readily apparent that the French patriarch of liberal political thought, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, incontrovertibly confirms that the migration of a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology within a state is inexorably destabilizing, and, in addition, specifically cites the penetration of foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology into the Roman state as the underlying cause for the Roman Empire's irrevocable decline and collapse. Moreover, in one of the quintessential and pre-eminent expositions of realist political theory, *Discourses on Livy*, the august primogenitor of realism, Niccolò Machiavelli, argues that, if a state is injected with a

foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, then its political constitution and national security will ineluctably become compromised, and, as a result, the state will unequivocally implode into a degenerative and ultimately fatal cycle of anarchy and insecurity, if it is not expediently reoriented according to its foundational political ideology and essential political constitution. For example, Machiavelli states in *Discourses on Livy* that:

Because of the liberality that the Romans practiced in giving citizenship to foreigners, so many new men were born in Rome that they began to have so much share in the votes that the government began to vary, and it departed from the things and from the men with which it was accustomed to go. When Q. Fabius, who was censor, perceived this, he put all these new men from whom this disorder derived under four tribes, so that by being shut in such small spaces they could not corrupt all Rome (Machiavelli 1996, 309-310).

In this quotation, Machiavelli clearly explains that the growth of foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology within the Roman Empire had begun to destabilize the Roman state and lead it towards its own ruin. Moreover, in this quotation, Machiavelli also communicates that the destabilizing effect of this foreign ideology was only prevented from spreading throughout the Roman state via the segregation of the foreign ideology into four tribes or sectors that, due to their confinement, could barely interact with the Roman political apparatus. Without this confinement, Machiavelli acknowledges that these foreign ideologies would have corrupted the Roman citizens, as well as fundamentally compromised the national security and political constitution of the Roman state.

Additionally, Niccolò Machiavelli explains that all states must undergo a renewal or regeneration process, whereby they divest themselves of the foreign, inherently contradictory ideologies, norms, and values that have come to rest within their borders, and thereby return to their own fundamental 'good', or foundational national ideology. Machiavelli argues that, if a state should fail to undergo this renewal or regeneration process, then the state risks its own inevitable ruin and insecurity, due to the ever-increasing influence of the debased ideologies and values that have invariably come to rest within the state's borders. For instance, Machiavelli states in *Discourses on Livy* that:

It is a very true thing that all worldly things have a limit to their life; but generally those got the whole course that is ordered for them by heaven that do not disorder their body but keep it ordered so that it does not alter or, if it alters, it is for safety and not to its harm. Because I am speaking of mixed bodies, such as republics and sects, I say that those alterations are for safety that lead them back towards their beginnings. So those are better ordered and have longer life that by means of their orders can often be renewed or indeed that through some accident outside the said order came to the said renewal. And it is a thing clearer than light that these bodies do not last if they do not renew themselves (Machiavelli 1996, 209).

Furthermore, Machiavelli states that:

The mode of renewing them is, as was said, to lead them back towards their beginnings. For all the beginning of sects, republics, and kingdoms must have some goodness in them, by means of which they may regain their first reputation and their first increase. Because in the process of time that goodness is corrupted, unless something intervenes to lead it back to the mark, it of necessity kills that body (Machiavelli 1996, 209).

and that:

one should not wish ten years at most to pass from one to another of such executions; for when this time is past, men begin to vary in their customs and to transgress the laws. Unless something arises by which punishment is brought back to their memory and fear is renewed in their spirits, soon so many delinquents join together that they can no longer be punished without danger [...] Men began to dare to dare to try new things and to say evil; and so it is necessary to provide for it, drawing [the state] back toward its beginnings (Machiavelli 1996, 210-211).

In the preceding quotations from *Discourses on Livy*, Niccolò Machiavelli emphatically describes how every state must return to its foundational national political ideology and expunge the foreign, inherently contradictory, ideologies and values from its political constitution that have, over time, penetrated into the state and gestated within its bowels, or else the myriad foreign, inherently contradictory, ideologies that have corrupted the state's political institutions and which seek expression within the political constitution of the state will subvert the state and cause it to implode.

Evidently therefore, via the aforementioned quotations from the incontrovertible and obligatory exposition of realist political theory, *Discourses on Livy*, Niccolò Machiavelli, the ineffable paterfamilias of realism, confirms that, if a state is injected with a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, then that state's political constitution and national security will inexorably become compromised, and, as a result, the state will inevitably implode into a degenerative cycle of anarchy and insecurity, if it is not expediently reoriented according to its foundational political ideology and quintessential political constitution.

Consequently, it is clear that Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, one of liberalism's patron saints, and Niccolò Machiavelli, realism's prodigious patriarch and pre-eminent protagonist, both incontrovertibly confirm that, if a state is penetrated with a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, then the state's political constitution and national security will ineluctably become compromised, and, consequently, the state will unerringly implode into a degenerative cycle of anarchy and insecurity, if it is not reoriented according to its foundational political ideology and constitution. Moreover, it is therefore readily apparent that, despite the supplications of modern liberalism, the constitutive and inviolable documents of liberal political thought, in addition to the essential, indispensable, elucidations of realist political theory, unequivocally confirm that, if any state fails to adequately restrict the migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will inevitably become penetrated by a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, and, as a result, eviscerated by an unrelenting insecurity.

CONCLUSION

Perforce, the rudimentary processes of globalization have eliminated innumerable erstwhile, archaic, impediments to international migration, and, consequently, the migration of people, goods, and ideas between states has become inordinately prevalent within the modern international political system. For example, enormous refugee populations have emerged from within collapsing states, such as Syria, and now migrate throughout the international political system in search of solace within foreign, stable, states (Syria's Civil War Explained: The Syrian Civil War Is the Deadliest Conflict the 21st Century Has Witnessed Thus Far 2016). Moreover, countless contemporary states have become enamored of the benefits that can, potentially, accompany the fluctuations of international migration, and, as a result, they have revised and liberalized their political policies, in order to encourage the migration of people, goods, and ideas across their borders (EUR-Lex: Access to European Union Law 2011). Evidently therefore, it is imperative to ascertain the nature of international migration and to determine the detriments, as well as the advantages, that accompany its processes, in order to accurately comprehend and conceptualize the dynamics of state security within the modern international political system.

As the advent of globalization has continued to enable and encourage the migration of people and ideas throughout the international political system, certain political pundits have become captivated by the superficial benefits that, at times, accompany the movements of peoples and ideologies (Kukathas 2005, 215). Consequently, during the modern era, a barely restricted, minimally regulated, migration of people and ideas throughout the international political system has become the subject of categorical praise and arduous adulation (Baylis et al. 2008, 8). However, although innumerable contemporary liberal political actors fervently promote unrestrictive, inadequate migration policies and enthusiastically proclaim that the migration of people and ideas between states is a quintessentially beneficial process, their proclamations are utterly misled and impressively inaccurate. Rather, despite the romantic edicts of modern liberalism, the experiences and the histories of innumerable nations unequivocally demonstrate that, if any state fails to adequately restrict the international migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will incontrovertibly become destabilized, and its national security irrevocably shattered, due to the fact that the state's minimally restrictive, inadequate, and ineffectual, migration policies will inevitably cause the state to be penetrated by a foreign ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology and values.

Firstly, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the inherently contradictory ideology struggles for political expression within the state, the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents comprehensively reject the state, as well as the legitimate channels for political expression within the state, due to the fact that the state, along with its essential political institutions, structures, and laws, is predicated upon a fundamental political ethos and values that the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents explicitly repudiate. Subsequently, when the inherently contradictory ideology and its adherents pursue political expression and accommodation within the state, they struggle violently against the state, without a modicum of respect for the state's essential laws or the rights of the state's citizenry, which causes the state's citizenry to become reciprocally violent and hostile in

turn, since their security has been demonstrably threatened via this flagrant violation and disregard of the state, its constitutive laws, and its fundamental political order. As a result, the state and its society degenerate into a condition that distinctly mirrors the hostile, Hobbesian state of nature, and, consequently, overwhelming insecurity and instability permeate throughout the state.

Moreover, if a state is penetrated by an ideology that inherently contradicts its own respective foundational political ideology, then, when the state attempts to accommodate the inherently contradictory ideology within its socio-political fabric, the state is inevitably forced to abandon its fundamental political ethos and values, as well as its essential political apparatus and laws, since the state attempts to express a political ideology which categorically controverts and repudiates as invalid the constitutive principles of the state's society and its political structure as a whole. Consequently, the state inexorably deviates from the political trajectory and the political constitution that previously engendered its success and prosperity within the international political system, as well as allowed it to secure itself against the omnipresent, eternal rigors of fortuna. Therefore, the state becomes destabilized, fraught with insecurity, and inevitably collapses into a high inescapable degenerative cycle, which terminates, necessarily, with the manifestation of anarchic conditions within the state and, summarily, the state's precipitous collapse.

In fact, although modern liberals incessantly promote the EU as a living exemplar for the virtues of contemporary liberalism and basic, unrestrictive, migration policies, the experiences of innumerable contemporary EU states emphatically contradict these spurious claims. For example, when the experiences of various EU states, such as France or Denmark, are analyzed, the experiences of these woe-begotten, despondent nations unequivocally confirm that, instead of becoming enriched or improved, the states of the EU have actually deteriorated and become fraught with rampant social conflict, insecurity, and instability, as a result of their minimally restrictive, liberal, migration policies and consequent penetration with the foreign, inherently contradictory ideology of orthodox Islam.

Furthermore, despite the ignorant exclamations of modern liberals and their incessant promotion of an unrestricted migration of people, goods, and ideas between states, the foundational and inviolable documents of liberal political thought, in addition to the pre-eminent, indispensable elucidations of realism, explicitly confirm that, if any state fails to adequately restrict the migration of people and ideas across its borders, then that state will inevitably become penetrated by a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, and, as a result, brutally eviscerated by an unrelenting insecurity. For instance, in one of the obligatory articulations of liberal political theory, *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*, the seminal architect of liberal political thought, Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, incontrovertibly declares that the migration of a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology within a state is inevitably destabilizing and profoundly pernicious; in addition, the Baron de Montesquieu specifically cites the penetration of foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology into the Roman state as the underlying cause for the Roman Empire's unceremonious decline and virulent collapse. Moreover, in one of the quintessential expositions of realist political theory, *Discourses on Livy*, the primogenitor of realism, Niccolò Machiavelli, argues that, if a state is injected with a foreign, inherently contradictory, ideology, then its political constitution and national security will ineluctably

become compromised, and, consequently, the state will unerringly implode into a degenerative cycle of anarchy and insecurity, if it is not expediently reoriented according to its original, foundational political ideology and values.

Therefore, it is readily apparent that, in spite of the idealistic and endearing supplications of modern liberalism, if any state adopts minimal, meagerly restrictive, migration policies and fails to appropriately restrict the migration of people and ideas throughout its society, then that state will certainly become destabilized, and its national security irrevocably shattered, due to the fact that the state's ineffective, unrestrictive, and inadequate migration policies will inevitably cause the state to become penetrated by a foreign ideology that inherently contradicts the state's own respective foundational political ideology and fundamentally repudiates its essential political structure.

As a result, it is incontrovertible that, although modern liberals unabashedly and incessantly extoll the virtues of an uninhibited migration of people, ideas, and goods throughout the international political system under the pretenses of personal liberty and cosmopolitan human rights, the aforementioned exhortations are maliciously false, and, instead, represent a meager ideological manifestation of modern liberalism's insatiable appetite for excess and flagrant disregard for security, rather than any altruistic or legitimate attempt to ameliorate the desperate plight of states within the inherently anarchic international political system. Moreover, it is subsequently ineluctable that, in order to elicit the economic and social benefits that are so often discussed and, yet, so rarely achieved vis a vis international migration, modern states must implement realistic, protectionist, migration policies and embrace the supreme Socratic virtue of abject moderation, not an unmitigated international migration of people and ideas, or else they court the affectations of a terrible insecurity, rather than the enervating embrace of economic increase and the supple, sensuous, caress of social stimulation.

REFERENCES

1. Baron de Montesquieu, Charles de Secondat. *Considerations on the Causes of The Greatness of the Romans and Their Decline*. trans. David Lowenthal. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1999.
2. Baylis, John et al. "Introduction." in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction*
3. *to International Relations, Fourth Edition*. ed. John Baylis et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
4. Brochmann et al. *Immigration Policy and the Scandinavian Welfare State, 1945-2010*. Palgrave-Macmillan, 2012.
5. Dekmejian, R. Hrair. "The Rise of political Islamism in Saudi Arabia." *Middle East Journal*. Middle East Institute, 1994. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4328744>> [4 December 2015].
6. Doty, Roxanne Lynn. "Why Is People's Movement Restricted?" in *Global Politics: A New Introduction*. ed. Jenny Edkins and Maja Zehfuss. New York: Routledge, 2009.
7. Dunne, Tim. "Liberalism." in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, Fourth Edition*. ed. Baylis et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
8. EUR-Lex: Access to European Union Law. *A Common Immigration Policy for Europe: Summary*. 16 May 2011. <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV:jl0001>> [7 July 2016].
9. Evans, Jane et al. "Pictured: Danish Lone Wolf 'Jihadi' Who Was Gunned Down by Police After Terror Shootings Which Killed Film Director and Jewish Security Guard - Weeks After He Was Released from Prison Over Knife Attack." *Daily Mail*. 14 February 2015. <<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2953594/Shots-fired-Copenhagen-cafe-free-speech-event.html>> [7 December 2015].
10. "France: The Third Republic and the 1905 Law of Laïcité." *Berkley Center for Religion, Peace, and World Affairs at Georgetown University*. <<http://berkeleycenter.georgetown.edu/essays/france-the-third-republic-and-the-1905-law-of-em-laicite-em>> [9 December 2015].
11. French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development. *Terrorism: A Very Real Threat*. 2016. <<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/defence-security/terrorism/>> [6 July 2016].
12. Griffin, Andrew. "France State of Emergency Declared for Three Months, Allowing Authorities to Shut Down Websites and Giving Police Sweeping New Powers." *The Independent*. 19 November 2015. <<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/france-state-of-emergency-declared-for-three-months-allowing-authorities-to-shut-down-websites-and-a6740886.html>> [10 December 2015].
13. Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. ed. Edwin Curley. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994.
14. Institute for Migration Research and Intercultural Studies. *Focus Migration: France*. March 2007. <<http://focus-migration.hwwi.de/France.1231.0.html?&L=1>> [6 July 2016].

15. Kaplan, Michael. "Anti-Muslim Hate Crime in Denmark? Cemetery Vandalism Draws Condemnations, Demonstration in Odense." *International Business Times*. 2 September 2015. <<http://www.ibtimes.com/anti-muslim-hate-crime-denmark-cemetery-vandalism-draws-condemnations-demonstration-2079211>> [11 December 2015].
16. Kern, Soeren. "France Seeks to Reclaim 'No-Go' Zones." Gatestone Institute: International Policy Council. 24 August 2012. <<http://www.gatestoneinstitute.org/3305/france-no-go-zones>> [6 July 2016].
17. Kukathas, Chandran. "The Case for Open Immigration." in *Contemporary Debates in Applied Ethics*. ed. Andrew I. Cohen and Christopher Heath Wellman. Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
18. Leiken, Robert S. "Europe's Angry Muslims." Council on Foreign Relations. August 2005. <<http://www.cfr.org/religion/europes-angry-muslims/p8218>> [6 December 2015].
19. Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy*. trans. Harvey C. Mansfield and Nathan Tarcov. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
20. Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. trans. Harvey C. Mansfield. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
21. Perrault, Guillaume and Anne-Laure Debaecker. "Natacha Polony-Gaspard Koenig: comment peut-on être libéral?" *Le Figaro*. 25 March 2015. <http://www.lefigaro.fr/vox/economie/2015/03/25/31007-20150325ARTFIG00374-natacha-polony-gaspard-koenig-comment-peut-on-etre-liberal.php>> [5 December 2015].
22. Senguptanov, Somini. "At Least 100 Dead in India Terror Attacks." *The New York Times*. 26 November 2008. http://www.nytimes.com/2008/11/27/world/asia/27mumbai.html?_r=0> [6 July 2016].
23. "Syria's Civil War Explained: The Syrian Civil War Is the Deadliest Conflict the 21st Century Has Witnessed Thus Far." *Al Jazeera*. 24 May 2016. <<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/05/syria-civil-war-explained-160505084119966.html>> [7 July 2016].
24. "Terror Suspects Guilty in Planned Jyllands-Posten Attack." *The Copenhagen Post*. 4 June 2012. <<http://cphpost.dk/news/national/terror-suspects-guilty-in-planned-jyllands-posten-attack.html>> [6 July 2016].
25. Warner, Jeremy. "France Is a Nation in Decline-and Britain Could Be Next." *The Telegraph*. 19 October 2014. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/france/11171314/France-is-a-nation-in-decline-and-Britain-could-be-next.html>> [6 July 2016].
26. Woods, Ngaire. "International Political Economy in an age of Globalization." in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, Fourth Edition*. ed. John Baylis et al. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
27. Your Europe. *Travel Documents for EU Nationals*. 16 June 2015. <http://europa.eu/youreurope/citizens/travel/entry-exit/eu-citizen/index_en.htm> [8 December 2015].